

Remarks

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Thus, claim 1 has been amended to rearrange its wording, but also to require that the raw material polysaccharide is hydrolyzed before sulfating it. This is based on the disclosure at page 6, lines 21-27 of the specification, as exemplified in Examples 1, 3 and 4.

Claim 4 has been amended for additional clarity.

Claim 7 has been amended to add a requirement for a carrier, to more clearly distinguish the subject matter of claim 7 from the claims on which it depends. Please see the disclosure in the paragraph bridging pages 9 and 10 of the specification, showing formulations for the anti-coagulant.

Claim 8, which has been rejected under both the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. §112, has been replaced by new claim 13, drafted in method of use format, referring to the use in claim 8.

Claim 9, also rejected under both the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. §112, has been amended to claim a unit preparation of the anti-thrombus agent.

In view of the cancellation of claim 8, and the amendment of claim 9, Applicants respectfully submit that the grounds for rejecting these claims under the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. §112 have been rendered moot.

The patentability of the presently claimed invention over the disclosure of the reference relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims will be apparent upon consideration of the following remarks.

Thus, the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Miyamoto et al., as well as the rejection of claims 5-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over this reference, are respectfully traversed.

As indicated above, claim 1, which is the only independent claim in the application, has been amended to require that the raw material polysaccharide is hydrolyzed before sulfating it. Referring to the disclosure in paragraph [0011] of the specification, this pretreatment of the raw material polysaccharide, prior to sulfating it,

results in lowering the molecular weight of the polysaccharide. This feature of the present invention is neither disclosed in, nor suggested by, the Miyamoto et al. reference. For this reason, the claims are directed to subject matter which is clearly patentable over this reference.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that each of the grounds of rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Takashi KOMAI et al.

By: 

Michael R. Davis
Registration No. 25,134
Attorney for Applicants

MRD/pth
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
August 6, 2007